

1 comparing via the server the adjusted quantity with a first  
2 threshold; and

3 when the adjusted quantity is less than the first threshold,  
4 invoking a corrective action.  
5

### **REMARKS**

Various element numbers listed in Applicant's specification were inadvertently omitted from the drawings provided at the time of filing. Corrected drawings are now submitted along with a letter to the Official Draftsperson. Support is found in the specification. No new matter is entered.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of independent claim 6 and also to distinctly point out a nexus with technology. Support is found in claim 6 as originally filed and Applicant's specification page 6 to page 8 line 13. No new matter is entered.

Claim 6 is cancelled.

Claims 7 - 10 are amended to provide proper antecedent reference.

New claims 11 and 12 are added. Support is found in claim 1 as originally filed as well as throughout Applicant's specification. No new matter is entered.

Claims 1 - 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. However, claim 1 is amended above to incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 6 as well as provide a nexus with technology. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claims 2 - 5, 7 - 10 are all dependent on allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable. In light of the amendments above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1 - 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tedesco (6,298,972) in view of Miyazaki (6,615,714). The Examiner states correctly that Tedesco does not show the buyer being on-line. However, neither does Miyazaki show a buyer being on-line. Furthermore, Applicant's claim 1 as amended above requires both on-line and in-person shoppers. Neither Tedesco nor Miyazaki describe both types of shoppers in their methods and systems. Claim 1 is therefore now allowable over Tedesco and Miyazaki and such allowance is urged. Claims 2 - 5 and 7 - 10 are all dependent on allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable.

New claims 11 and 12 recite all of the limitations of allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35. U.S.C. 103(a) and allow all of the pending claims.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance

with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 06/16/04

By: John R. Pivnichny  
John R. Pivnichny  
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607) 429-4358  
Fax: (607) 429-4119